

JANICE EVANS,

v.

HUONG T. LE, et al.,

UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
Northern Distr	ict of California
Oakland	l Division
	No. C 11-00132 LB
Plaintiff,	ORDER RE SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE
Defendant.	

On January 9, 2012, the above-captioned case was referred to the undersigned for a settlement conference. On January 11, 2012, the court issued a notice and order regarding settlement conference. ECF No. 30. The order directs the parties to lodge settlement conference statements no less than seven days prior to the conference. *Id.* at 3. Accordingly, settlement conference statements were due on March 6, 2012. Le did not submit a statement and her counsel did not return this chambers' telephone calls. Then, on March 8, 2012, the court issued another order directing Le to lodge a settlement conference statement by 9:00 a.m. on Friday, March 9, 2012. ECF No. 46 at 1. Again, Le did not submit a statement and her counsel did not return this chambers' telephone calls. At this point, Plaintiff's counsel explained that Le's counsel faced extenuating family circumstances. The court sought to accommodate Le and her counsel, continuing the settlement conference until April 6, 2012 and reiterating that settlement conference statements were due on March 30, 2012. ECF No. 47 at 1. Once again, Le neither lodged a statement nor did her counsel return the chambers' telephone calls.

C 11-00132 LB ORDER

Case 3:11-cv-00132-EMC Document 49 Filed 04/02/12 Page 2 of 2

•		Camouna	
	1010101		
	The Court of the C		
•			

DISTRICT COORT	istrict of California
CHIED SIAIES	For the Northern Dis

The court ORDERS Le to lodge a settlement conference statement that fully complies with the
court's order filed at ECF No. 30 by 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 3, 2012. Le must also email a
copy to lbpo@cand.uscourts.gov by this time. Le is warned that a failure to comply with this order
may result in sanctions for each day's delay, beginning from the date it was originally due (March 6
2012). See Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992) ("District courts have the
inherent power to control their dockets and, '[i]n the exercise of that power they may impose
sanctions " (quoting <i>Thompson v. Housing Auth.</i> , 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986))).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 2, 2012

LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge